



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/840,437	04/23/2001	Tadamasa Kitsukawa	50P4416	4173

7590

07/18/2005

John L. Rogitz
Rogitz & Associates
Suite 3120
750 B Street
San Diego, CA 92101

EXAMINER

SRIVASTAVA, VIVEK

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2617

DATE MAILED: 07/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/840,437	Applicant(s) KITSUKAWA ET AL.	
	Examiner Vivek Srivastava	Art Unit 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 May 2005.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-10, 12-18 and 20-27 is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) 4, 11 and 19 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 4, 9, 11, 16 and 19, have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argues "for each and every taking of official notice, should the rejections be persisted, Applicant hereby requests not only a prior art showing by also the requisite prior art suggestion to combine the allegedly well-known feature in the combination being rejected".

Regarding the Official Notice taken in claims 5, 6, 12, 13 and 20, the Examiner cites Berstis et al (US 5,867,154). Berstis teaches a remote control for a television system wherein the remote control comprises a web button 146 (fig 1D) for accessing the Internet. It would have been obvious to one having routine skill in the art to modify the remote control of Kikinis to include a web button for the benefit of direct connection to the an internet gateway scree.

Regarding the Official Notice taken in claim 24, the Examiner cites Budow et al (US 5,661,517) and Nishioka et al (US 6,199,206). Budow et al teaches a television memory for storing icons (claims 32 and 41) and Nishioka et al teaches a television storage means for storing EPG text and hyper text data (see col 3 lines 50 – 54). The motivation for combining either Bodow or Nishioka with Kikinis would have been

Art Unit: 2617

knowledgeable to one having routine skill in the art for the added benefit of having storing information locally enabling information to be readily available.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1- 3, 5 – 10, 12 – 18 and 20 – 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis (US 5,929,849) in view of Hendricks et al (US 6,738,978).

Regarding claim 1, Kikinis discloses a gateway screen (fig 2c) for a interactive television 51 (fig 1) comprising at least one television content panel 55 and at least one internet content panel 71 (see fig 2c). It is noted that the television content and internet content is simultaneously displayed when the television is turned on.

Kikinis fails to disclose the claimed displaying the gateway screen when the television is initially turned on.

In analogous art, Hendricks teaches providing and displaying an introductory menu screen upon power up (see col 43 lines 37 – 44) or when the television is initially turned on. It would have been obvious to modify Kikinis to include providing and

Art Unit: 2617

displaying of the gateway screen when the interactive television is turned on for the benefit of providing system options and information to user immediately and quickly and to eliminate the need for a user interaction prior to displaying the gateway screen.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hendricks to include the claimed limitation to provide the added benefits discussed above.

Regarding claim 2, Kikinis discloses a gateway screen (fig 2c) for a interactive television 51 (fig 1) comprising at least one television content panel 55 and at least one internet content panel 71 (see fig 2c). It is noted that the television content and internet content is simultaneously displayed when the television is turned on.

Kikinis fails to disclose the claimed the gateway screen is displayed at least upon initial energization of the television.

In analogous art, Hendricks teaches providing and displaying an introductory menu screen upon power up (see col 43 lines 37 – 44). It would have been obvious to modify Kikinis to include providing and displaying of the gateway screen when the interactive television is turned on for the benefit of providing system options and information to user immediately and quickly and to eliminate the need for a user interaction prior to displaying the gateway screen. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hendricks to include the claimed limitation to provide the added benefits discussed above.

Claim 3 is met by the discussions above.

Art Unit: 2617

Regarding claims 5, 6, 12, 13, and 20 Kikinis fails to disclose the claimed gateway screen button and the gateway screen is displayed when the gateway screen button is toggled and the claimed remote control unit, the remote control unit having a gateway screen button and the gateway screen is displayed when the gateway screen button is toggled.

Official notice is taken it is well known to include a television remote control with an internet button to provide a direct connection to a internet gateway screen. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kikinis to include the claimed limitation to provide a quick and direct connection to a internet gateway screen.

Regarding claims 7 and 8, It is noted that the interactive television receives information from the web server and a television signal source (see fig 1 and col 5 lines 26 – col 6 line 32, signal is inherently received from CATV headend).

Regarding claim 9, Kikinis discloses an interactive television system comprising a web server (col 6 lines 10-12), at least one interactive television server (server coupled to ISDN 39 and line 41, and at least one television source providing television signals via CATV 17 (see fig 1). It is noted that the interactive television receives information from the web server, the interactive television server and the television signal source (see fig 1 and col 5 lines 26 – col 6 line 32). It is further noted that the interactive television periodically displays gateway screen (fig 2c), the gateway region having at least one television content region 55 and internet region 71, periodically, when user selects the BMW to receive internet information.

Kikinis fails to disclose the claimed the gateway screen is displayed at least upon initial energization of the television. See claim 2 above.

Regarding claim 10, it is noted that the gateway screen (fig 2c) is displayed when the interactive television is turned on.

Regarding claims 14 and 15, Kikinis discloses television content region 55 displaying advertising from television signal source (inherently from CATV headend, also see col 6 lines 64 – 67) and internet content region 71 displaying content from a web server (see col 6 lines 10-12).

Claims 16 – 18 are met by the discussions above.

Claims 21 and 22 are met by the discussions above.

Regarding claim 23, Kikinis discloses a remote control 63 (see col 17 – 32) for selecting the BMW emblem to display the gateway screen (fig 2c) based on the user input.

Regarding claim 24, Kikinis fails to disclose the claimed wherein the gateway screen is stored in a memory within an interactive television.

Official notice is taken storing information in local television enables information to be readily available and eliminates the need for an external memory. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kikinis to include the claimed limitation to have information readily available and to eliminate the need for an external memory.

Regarding claims 25 – 26, Kikinis discloses displaying BMW web page concurrently with the real time broadcasted BMW commercial and thus discloses the

Art Unit: 2617

claimed the internet content panel is related to content in the television content panel and wherein content in the television content panel is received real-time from a broadcast.

Regarding claim 27, Kikinis discloses the claimed storage associated with the television (see VRAM – col 5 lines 48 – 55).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4, 11 and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Knudson et al (6,526,577) – Enhanced EPG

Narayan et al (6,859,937) – Context – sensitive options panel

Ward, III et al (6,756,997) – Multi-panel EPG


Legall et al (6,005,565) – EPG displaying internet panel and video panel

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vivek Srivastava whose telephone number is (703) 305-4038. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday from 9 am to 6 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Grant can be reached on (703) 305-4755. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Vs
7/13/05


VIVEK SRIVASTAVA
PRIMARY EXAMINER